



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,063	03/16/2001	Joe A. Harrison	INTL-0519-US (P10729)	7275
21906	7590	12/23/2004	EXAMINER	
TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100 HOUSTON, TX 77024			TRAN, THANH Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2822	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/811,063

Applicant(s)

JOE A. HARRISON

Examiner

Thanh Y. Tran

Art Unit

2822

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-5, 42 and 43.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 6, 8-30, 35-37, 39-41 and 44-48.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AMIR ZARABIAN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claimed limitations are met over the prior art. Applicant argued that the Examiner has failed to show the requisite suggestion or motivation to establish a prima facie case of obviousness when combine references of Boutros et al and Tseng et al for claims 6, 8-14, 25-30, 35-37 and 44-48. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's argument because Boutros et al discloses all limitations in the claims except for "a slot connector housing assembly mounted on a motherboard of a computer system". Tseng et al discloses in figures 1A-3A a circuit board wherein a slot connector housing assembly (1) is mounted on a motherboard (personal computer "PC" board 100) of a computer system (see col. 1, lines 15-40 in Tseng et al). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Boutros by using a slot connector housing assembly mounted on a motherboard of a computer system to provide an interface for the communication system (see col. 1, lines 15-40 in Tseng et al). With respect to claims 15-20, Applicant argued that the Examiner fails to show the alleged suggestion or motivation to establish a prime facie case of obviousness when combine references of Boutros and Pope. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's argument because Boutros et al discloses all limitations in the claims except for the housing which is formed from a material having a thermal conductivity of at least approximately 0.27 W/m-K. Pope et al teaches a housing (connector) comprising a material of Zenite (liquid crystal polymer) (see col. 57, lines 1-21) for conducting heat away from the circuit board. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing of Boutros et al by using a material of Zenite (liquid crystal polymer) (which inherently has the same thermal conductivity and approximately 0.27 W/m-K as the liquid crystal polymer of the invention) for providing a good thermal conductor/conductance for conducting heat away from the inserted card/board when it is inserted into the slot of the connector housing. With respect to claims 21-24 and 39-41, Applicant also argued that the Examiner fails to show where the prior art contains the alleged suggestion or motivation to modify Boutros' connector with the thermal features described in Volz. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's argument because Boutros discloses all limitations in the claims except for the fins in the housing for conducting heat away from the circuit board. Volz et al teaches in figure 1 a housing (10) comprising fins (20) to promote conduction of heat away from the circuit board (see col. 3, line 60 - col. 4, line 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Boutros et al by including fins as taught by Volz et al for the purpose of releasing heat from the circuit board..



AMIR ZARABIAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800